

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 16, 2008 has been received and its contents have been carefully reviewed.

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 31 and 32 are objected due to minor informalities.

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) to U.S. Patent No. 5,811,177 to Shi et al.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 26, 28, 31 and 32 to further define the invention. Accordingly, Claims 26, 28, 29, 31-32 and 35-42 remain pending in this application for further consideration.

**Objection to Claims 31 and 32**

Claims 31 and 32 are objected to because of minor informalities. Since claims 31 and 32 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments, Applicants respectfully assert that the objection to claims 31 and 32 be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Since claims 26, 28, 31 and 32 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, Claims 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Shi et al. Independent claims 26, 31 and 32 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection might be reapplied to the claims as presently amended, it is respectfully traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in the claims.

The rejection of claims 26 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 26 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 26 recite a combination of elements including, for example, "a heat-exhausting layer formed of a metal thin film and provided at the inner side of the seal cover plate, and a sealant having a thickness larger than that of the electro-luminescent layer and the metal electrode for adhering an edge of the flat seal cover plate and the heat-exhausting layer to the transparent substrate". AAPA and Shi et al., whether taken singly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The rejection of claims 31 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 31 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 31 recite a combination of elements

including, for example, “a heat-exhausting layer formed of a metal thin film and provided at the inner side of the seal cover plate, the heat-exhausting layer exposes a portion of the seal cover plate to provide a moisture-absorbing agent at the inner side of the seal cover plate; a sealant having a thickness larger than that of the electro-luminescent layer and the metal electrode for adhering an edge of the flat seal cover plate and the heat-exhausting layer to the transparent substrate”. AAPA and Shi et al., whether taken singly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The rejection of claims 32 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 32 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 32 recite a combination of elements including, for example, “a heat-exhausting layer formed of a metal thin film and provided at the inner side of the seal cover plate, the heat-exhausting layer exposes a portion of the seal cover plate to provide a moisture-absorbing agent at the inner side of the seal cover plate; a sealant having a thickness larger than that of the electro-luminescent layer and the metal electrode for adhering an edge of the flat seal cover plate to the transparent substrate, said sealant having a space for injecting an inactive gas”. AAPA and Shi et al., whether taken singly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 U SPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Accordingly, for at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 26, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that

dependent claims 28, 29 and 35-42 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from respective independent claims 26, 31 and 32 and the features set forth therein.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 26, 28, 29, 31, 32 and 35-42 are in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Xiaobin You  
Reg. No. L0112

Dated: April 10, 2008

Customer No.: 009629

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-3000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001